

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT TACOMA

7 RICHARD ROY SCOTT,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 KELLY CUNNINGHAM,

11 Defendant.

NO. C11-5509 BHS/KLS

ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINE TO
RESPOND

12 Before the Court is Defendant's motion (ECF No. 118) for an extension of time to
13 respond to Plaintiff's motions (ECF Nos. 63, 85, 94, 101, 102¹, 109, 111 and his objections
14 (no ECF Nos. yet) to the Court's Reports and Recommendations at ECF Nos. 105-107.

15 Plaintiff does not object. ECF No. 127.

16 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED:**

17 (1) Defendants' motion for an extension (ECF No. 118) is **GRANTED**.

18 (2) Defendant's responses to ECF Nos. 101 and 111 are due **January 24, 2012**; to
19 ECF No. 109) is due **January 26, 2012**; to ECF No. 63, 85, 94 are due **January 30, 2012**; and
20 to Plaintiff's objections to ECF Nos. 105-107 (ECF Nos. not yet assigned) are due **January**
21 **30, 2012**.

22 //

23 //

24
25 ¹ Plaintiff's "Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order at ECF No. 102 does not require a
26 response. Pursuant to the case management order, any motions for temporary relief must first be reviewed by the
judge and the defendant need not file a response to the motion unless directed to do so by the judge.

(3) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for Defendants.

DATED this 17th day of January, 2012.


Karen L. Strombom
United States Magistrate Judge